

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,418	IKEDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sabiha Qazi	1612	

All Participants:

(1) Sabiha N. Qazi.

(2) Michael S. Gzybowski .

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 January 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

YES

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner called and discussed the dependency of claims 6, 7 and 8. Michael S. Gzybowski He requested to amend the claims by Examiner's amendment and claims 6-8 should be dependent on claim 5 and not on claim 6. This was an inadvertant typing error. Examiner also discuused the examples disclosed in the specification and the prior art of record and the arguments about unexpected results in the response Prior art does not teach the percarbocyclic acid or ester in the reaction mixture.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Sabiha Qazi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)